REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 27, 29 and 33 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1-33 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. However, claims 1 and 6 have been amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Examiner. Therefore, the rejections are believed to be overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ando et al (U.S. Patent 6,373,803). These rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, a computer readable recording medium on which content stream data to be read and executed by the computer is recorded, comprising a Stream OBject (SOB) formed with first and second Stream OBject Units (SOBUs), the first SOBU including first and second application time stamps (ATSs) that indicate reproducing time information of the SOBU, and a first application packet disposed between the first and second ATS in which a portion of the content stream data is packed, and the second SOBU including a second application packet, an end of which represents an end of the SOB and a mid-point of the second SOBU, and a stuffing packet in which the second ATS is copied and in which a payload is recorded. These features are not taught by the reference to Ando.

In particular, it is noted that, in rejecting the claim, the Examiner seems to be confusing the end of the second application packet as representing an end of the first SOBU. This, however, is not an accurate interpretation of the claim since the claim language clearly sets forth that the end of the second application packet represents an end of the SOB. This claim language is illustrated in FIG. 4 with the end of the second application packet (i.e., AP_PKT#N) being calibrated with the end of the SOB (and not either of the SOBUs) by the dotted line.

In contrast, according to Ando, the data area 23 and the sector #31 represent an end of the stream block #1, which, as noted by the Examiner, corresponds to a SOBU, but do not

represent an end of the stream object (SOB) (i.e., #A · 298).

Here, applicants acknowledge the presence of the Examiner's arguments in the first full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action and note that the arguments are believed to be incorrect. The Examiner states that the description of ECC block #β can be applied to ECC block #ε of the stream block #2, which is the last SOBU of the SOB. Thus, applicants point out that the Examiner's recognition of the difference between the SOBUs and the SOB in the claimed invention effectively nullifies the arguments at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the Office Action.

Further, it appears as though the Examiner's position rests upon the notion that ECC block #'s β and ε are interchangeable. Yet, the Examiner provides no evidence of that being the case. Indeed, a review of Ando indicates that, in fact, the ECC blocks are quite different and, thus, not interchangeable as suggested. For example, ECC block # ε includes a part of sectors 48-79, which may or may not include pack header 3, PES header 8, sector data header 13, data area 24 (which includes transport packet z, end code 32 and padding area 37), pack header 4, and padding packet 40 (which includes PES header 9 and padding area 38). None of these elements are found in ECC block # β. Similarly, none of the elements of ECC block # β are found in ECC block # ε.

In any case, the claim has been amended to recite with particularity that the end of the second application packet represents "an end of the SOB" and "a mid-point of the second SOBU." With respect to this recitation, no reasonable interpretation of Ando can be made to suggest that Ando discloses an application packet that represents an end of an SOB and a midpoint of an SOBU, as claimed.

Thus, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the reference to Ando and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 6, 15, 20, 27, 29 and 33, it is noted that these claims recite similar features as claim 1. Thus, these claims are patentably distinguished from claim 1 for similar reasons as set forth above. Therefore, the rejections of these claims are also believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of the dependent claims, it is noted that these rejections are believed to be overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _____9/5/07_____   By: _____

Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510